

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 3, 7 - 18, 22 - 23, 26 - 27, 30 - 31, and 34 - 42 are pending.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 4 - 6, 19 - 21, 24 - 25, 28 - 29, and 32 - 33 have been cancelled. Claims 34 - 42 have been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of this continuation application are respectfully requested.

In the April 13, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,398 to Leong et al. ("the Leong reference") in view of applicant admitted prior art on pages 1 - 2 of the specification and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,509,123 to Dobbins et al. ("the Dobbins reference"). This rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it is applicable to the currently pending claims.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to a router having a routing component that implements routing protocols for data processed by the router. A user can view and modify features of the router in real-time via an interface component. The interface component presents the features of the router to the user as a hierarchical tree having attributes that store values relating to the router protocols and components that represent functionality of the router protocols, the components containing one or more sub-components or attributes. The attributes are modifiable within a single initialization of the router.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites (with emphasis added):

1. A router comprising:
a routing component that implements IP routing protocols for data processed by the router, wherein a workstation functions as the router via the IP routing protocols; and
an interface component for a user to view and modify features of

the router in real-time, wherein the router utilizes a real-time operating system, the interface component displaying the features of the router to the user as a hierarchical tree having attributes that store values relating to the IP protocols and components that represent functionality of the IP protocols, the components containing one or more sub-components, the attributes being modifiable within a single initialization of the router, **one of the attributes indicating a priority of a dynamic routing protocol designated router election for a local network** and the hierarchical tree displaying the attributes, the components, and the subcomponents to the user.

Neither the Leong reference nor the Dobbins reference discloses, teaches, or suggests the router of claim 1, as amended. The Examiner states that Leong reference, Applicant Admitted Prior Art, and Dobbins reference fails to teach a dynamic routing protocol. (*Office Action, page 7*). The applicant agrees with the Examiner.

The Examiner further states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to display the attributes relating to a dynamic routing protocol designated router election for a local network. The Examiner stated that by providing this attribute it allows a network manager to have better understanding of the current router configuration and provide a quicker response for modifying the router configuration. (*Office Action, page 7*). However, applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in either of the references, as the Examiner himself acknowledges, where one of the attributes indicates a priority of a dynamic routing protocol designed router election for a local network.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). All of the limitations of claim 1, as

amended, have not been taught by the combination of the Leong and Dobbin references in combination with the AAPA. In order to meet this limitations of claim 1, as amended, the Examiner, by combining these references, has impermissibly used "hindsight" by using the applicant's teaching as a blueprint to hunt through the prior art for the claimed elements and then combine them as claimed. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Examiner has stated that a network manager would have provided this attribute to have better understanding of the current router configuration, but he does not identify that how this highlighted limitation is disclosed or suggested by the Leong / Dobbins / AAPA combination. In other words, the Examiner is stating why the references would be properly combinable but has not outlined why the references disclose the highlighted limitation. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the Leong reference and the Dobbin reference, alone or in combination.

Independent claims 7 and 13 recites similar limitations to independent claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 7 and 13 distinguish over the Leong reference, the Dobbin reference, and the applicant admitted prior art for similar reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claim 1, as amended.

Claims 2 - 3, 8 - 12, 14 - 18, 22 - 23, 26 - 27, and 30 - 31 depend, directly or indirectly on claims 1, 7, and 13 as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 - 3, 8 - 12, 14 - 18, 22 - 23, 26 - 27, and 30 - 31 distinguish over the Leong reference, the Dobbins reference, and the AAPA

for the same reasons as discussed above in regard to claims 1, 7, and 13.

Independent claim 34 distinguishes over the cited references.

Independent claim 34 recites:

A router comprising:

a routing component that implements IP routing protocols for data processed by the router, wherein a workstation functions as the router via the IP routing protocols; and

an interface component for a user to view and modify features of the router in real-time, wherein the router utilizes a real-time operating system, the interface component displaying the features of the router to the user as a hierarchical tree having attributes that store values relating to the IP protocols and components that represent functionality of the IP protocols, the components containing one or more sub-components, the attributes being modifiable within a single initialization of the router, **one of the attributes specifies how often the router should contact neighbor nodes in order to maintain a live connection**, and the hierarchical tree displaying the attributes, the components, and the subcomponents to the user.

Neither the Leong reference nor the Dobbins reference, or the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), discloses, teaches, or suggests the router of claim 34, as amended. The Examiner states that Leong reference, the AAPA, and the Dobbin reference fails to teach that the attributes relates to how often the router should contact neighbor nodes in order to maintain a live connection. (*Office Action, page 7*). The applicant agrees with the Examiner.

The Examiner further states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to display the attribute relating to how often the router should contact neighbor nodes in order to maintain a live connection. The Examiner stated that by providing this attributes, it allows a network manager to have better understanding of the current router configuration and provide a quicker response for modifying the router configuration. (*Office Action, page 7*). Again, applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or

suggestion in any of the three references, as the Examiner acknowledges, where an attribute specifies how often the router should contact neighbor nodes in order to maintain a live connection.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). All of the limitations of claim 1, as amended, have not been taught by the combination of the Leong and Dobbins references in combination with the AAPA. For support that the above-identified attribute would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, the Examiner has stated that a network manager would have provided these attributes to have better understanding of the current router configuration. However, the Examiner does not identify that how the above-highlighted highlighted limitation is disclosed or suggested by the Leong / Dobbins / AAPA combination. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 distinguishes over the Leong reference and the Dobbins reference, alone or in combination.

Independent claims 37 and 40 recited similar limitations to independent claim 34. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 37 and 40 distinguish over the Leong reference, the Dobbins reference, and the applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) for similar reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claim 34.

Claims 35 - 36, 38 - 39, and 41 - 42 depend, directly or indirectly, on independent claims 34, 37, and 40. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits

that dependent claims 35 - 36, 38 - 39, and 41 - 42 distinguish over the Leong reference, the Dobbins reference, and the AAPA for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claims 34, 37, and 40.

Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call either of the undersigned attorneys at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: July 13, 2004

By: Mark R. Kendrick

Mark R. Kendrick
Registration No. 48,468
Attorney For Applicant

Date: July 13, 2004

By: Roger R. Wise

Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney For Applicant

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033